

MICHAEL COOK: Good afternoon. I'm Michael Cook in the Census Bureau's Public Information Office. I'd like to welcome everyone here today that's present in the room, and also everyone else that's listening in on the phones. This afternoon, Census Bureau director Dr. Robert Groves will discuss the further release of results from the 2010 census.

Let me say a few words about today's webinar. First, as always, during our news conferences, once the presentation concludes, we will open the floor to questions from reporters in the room, as well as those that are on the phone. Also for those that are following us on Facebook and Twitter, you may also submit questions that way. We'll alternate between reporters in the room and those participating via the phones.

Second, let me point out that you can access our website, census.gov, to obtain additional background information about today's topic, as well as other material on the Census Bureau's data products. Without further delay, let me present to you Census Bureau Director, Dr. Robert Groves.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Thank you, Michael. I'm happy to be here today on a beautiful sunny day, finally, in Washington. It's actually quite warm here. We're going to run through a lot of different things today, so let me kind of give you a sense of where we are. On December 21st, as you know, we released the first results of the 2010 census, the official national population counts, and these counts ended up shifting 12 seats, affecting 18 different states in the House of Representatives. They also just began to paint the picture of how our country has changed over the last ten years and each release gives us more of that kind of information in the coming weeks.

As I've done in every press conference, I'm going to tell you a little about what's going to come in the next few weeks, and then I'm going to give you the latest findings on what we're doing in Suitland at headquarters to evaluate the 2010 census. So you're getting real time evaluative information, as well as an update on what's coming.

The big news is the releasing of data files for redistricting purposes that begins right now and continues through the end of March of this year. We're providing key demographics statistics to the states so that the state governments can redistrict within the states. We do this as the Census Bureau in a completely nonpartisan manner. We don't have any role in the redistricting process within the states. That's the job of state legislatures and officials in the states.

For every state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, the Census Bureau will provide summaries of population totals, as well as counts by race, Hispanic or Latino origin, and voting age, 18 years and older. We're also going to provide housing unit counts for a lot of different levels of geography. So in the coming weeks, we're going to put out really big files. They're going to be down to the block level. They'll have data on counties, minor civil divisions, state legislative districts, places, school districts, census tracts, block groups and blocks. And when appropriate, American Indian and Alaska Native areas, and Hawaiian homelands. So this is a gush of data coming out very, very quickly. The counts are available for the 46 states that voluntarily provide voting districts to the Census Bureau's redistricting data program. And then unique geographies that apply to Puerto Rico are also available in this process.

Let me give you a sense of how it's going to work. We're going to provide the figures on a state-by-state flow basis between now and the end of March. Everyone, every state, will receive their files by April 1. That's a legal deadline for us. And every week, we'll make an announcement of what states will come the following week. For example, last Friday we announced that Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey and Virginia would be the four states to get the first files, and those are being delivered as we speak.

Today, I can make another announcement for the following week. The states that will receive their files next week will be Arkansas, Indiana, Iowa, and Maryland; Arkansas, Indiana, Iowa and Maryland. And we have a little hope at headquarters that we might be

able to squeeze out other states, and we'll let you know as soon as we know whether we can add to that set. We're working real hard.

We will send out a media advisory announcing every time we ship data to a state. So that will be your alert that a state's going to get its file. The states redistricting counts are delivered in a very rigid way. First to the state's leadership, such as the governor or majority/minority leaders in the state legislature. The next day, after we send those, we verify that they were received. With that verification, we then send out a news release and at the time of the release we will place the data on our FTP site. So for those of you who want the huge data files to load into maps that you might want to write stories on, you'll have those on the FTP site.

In addition to the news release at that time, we're going to send you five custom tables that describe the data, the counts, for that particular state. In your press kit, you have some dummy tables that have the format of the tables we'll give you with each state's release. So you could look those over to get a sense of how you could deal with that for your particular interests. Within 24 hours of the press release, we'll post all those tables on the fact finder, the American fact finder website, which is a web tool that allows you to grab those tables right away. They're also available online in a press kit connected to the release.

Now, you may need more information about how to do this. We'll have a set of webinars that will help you through this process and help you get a sense of how to do things. The information for those webinars is in an online press kit that you can get right now.

A lot of you will want to put these counts into maps for your audience. You can now find the shape files for those mapping tools for all of the states already on our website. These were rolled out also on a state-by-state basis, but they're up there now. If you have trouble on this, loading those shape files, there's some special instructions online in the redistricting office website that you can find on our parent website.

So one question that all of us have is what are the neat stories in here? I got to tell you, we are working so hard to get the data out that we won't know all the neat stories. But we can't wait to look at certain things, and I thought you might want to know that. A big story that is possible from the tables we give you is just change, how has the state population changed between 2000 and 2010? And we give you that in columns of the tables so you could look at different sub populations you're interested on change. With the larger files down to smaller geographical areas, we're all interested in how there have been shifts in populations and neighborhoods, urban to rural, urban to suburban, and how those change across race and ethnicity groups.

The second big thing we're interested in is just the movement, the residential status, of different race and ethnicity groups. As we've noted from the American Community Survey findings in the past few years, it appears that the dispersion of new immigrant groups, new race and ethnicity groups throughout the country is a dominant story over the last few years. The official census counts in 2010 will give a real headline on that and we're anxious to look at this.

And then related to that is something that's of interest in this country, and that is the multiracial population. As you know, in the year 2000 we were allowed for the first time as residents to check multiple races to describe ourselves. Only about two percent of the population did that. We think that the change in that percentage and how that population distributes itself over space and age will be very interesting and we're looking forward to looking at that.

I can tell you that what we're going to do when we have time, and you can beat us to this because you're going to have more time, is to look at the 2010 census data and then compare it to the time trends from the American Community Survey on similar phenomena. So you can both do a story about how we've changed in ten years, and then

using the American Community Survey, you can see when things started to change in the decade. All of that is possible with data on American fact finder.

I got to give you one warning about a misinterpretation. We're going to give you housing unit counts as well. And we list in the tables the proportion of the houses that are vacant. You have to be careful about how you interpret that. For example, if you compared our housing unit counts and vacancy rates between our surveys and the census, you'll get mismatches because of the way we define a point in time of housing unit status. Our surveys have vacancy status determined during the data collection of the survey that sometimes goes over many weeks. For the census, we peg vacancy rate on April 1, 2010, so you'll get a little mismatch there.

Then of special concern, since we're all interested, I think, in vacancy rates throughout the country because of the foreclosure crisis, be careful that the vacancy rate that we're going to give you over the next few weeks includes both seasonally vacant houses like a cottage on a lake that is often vacant during the year, as well as permanent houses that happen to be vacant. I think most of our interest is the latter, not the former. So you will see high vacancy rates in vacation areas when we give you these files. Those shouldn't be interpreted as part of the foreclosure, the housing issues that face the country. So that's just a heads up to be careful.

So all this is coming over the next few weeks. I can tell you it's tons of data that we'll all be looking at for months and years. There are many, many different stories. We can't wait to see it and we can't wait to read the articles you're going to write on this.

I want to turn to something we're doing every day behind the scenes. We have a bunch of people asking the question, "How good is this census?" And I pledged to you that we would give you the data, the results of that, as we got them and I want to keep doing that. There are three ways to measure the quality of a census. We look at how well the data collection process proceeded. We call those process indicators. Two, we look at different

ways of estimating the population size to see if they agree with the census. And three, we have a special tool called a post enumeration survey whose total purpose is to try to find estimate quantitatively the quality of the census, and I want to just run those three.

So let's talk about process indicators. I first remind us that the mail return rate in the 2010 census matched the mail return rate of the short form in the 2000 census. And when you add in the long form of the 2000 census, the American public actually returned a larger portion of questionnaires because the long form had a lower return rate. That was a great platform on which-- it's a great process indicator that goes in the good direction.

On the bad side, we've noted several times that we got more proxy reports. What is that? After we call on your house repeatedly, if you didn't return a questionnaire, we never got you at home. We would go to a building manager or an informed other person to inquire about your occupancy. We had a little higher rate in 2010 than 2000, 22 percent versus 17 percent.

We now know some new things. We have finished the process, obviously, that evaluates every form that we have in our files. And we now know what percentage of the units supplied usable information for our counts. For a small percentage of households, after all the efforts to follow up with the household, to contact neighbors or building managers, we still have some about which we're not sure that they're occupied, vacant or even valid housing units. And in some of those cases, we actually impute a person level count and a status of the housing unit using statistical models that reflect the characteristics of the neighborhood.

We would like to keep that rate as low as possible. So, we are looking at what proportion, what percentage of the records in the census, gave us usable information. In the 2000 census, 99.45 percent, that's pretty close to 100 percent, of the records gave us usable housing unit records. In the 2010 census, that's slightly higher. It's a little better than in 2000, 99.62. Very close, we're very close to 100 percent. If you look at this graph, you'll

see that you can array that percentage on a state level. So let me help you through this. The X axis, the horizontal axis here, is the percent of the housing unit records in our files that gave us usable information to determine the status of the housing unit. These are 2010 data. The Y axis is the count of states.

So how do you read this? Well, the ideal form of this graph would be all the states, all 50 states, would be at 100 percent. Everybody gave usable data. You see that on average, we're at this 99.6, or so, if you took the average of those. But there's a spread. What we care about at this point is seeing a small spread across the states. We would like consistency across the states.

So, if you go to the next graph you can see what it looked like in 2000. The red is 2000, the blue is 2010. So what do we want? We want high values. It's neat that the blue has shifted to the right. It's closer to the 100 percent than the red, that's a good thing. And we want small variability. On the variability side, I can tell you measures of variability on these two dimensions shows that there's a slightly lower variability across states in the 2010 census than the 2000. But you can see yourself that you still get that spread. So we want low spread and high values on average.

We can do another thing recently, and if you go to the next graph, we can ask the question, "What percent of the people in the census now gave us usable person record data?" Similar kind of question, this is the 2010 distribution. Again, the ideal distribution would be all the states would be to the right at 100 percent, everybody gave good person level data. You see the spread there. The average for this is about 99.6. If you put on the 2000 data, you see once again we're shifted to the right this time, that's a good thing. We have larger proportions of states with high complete person records versus 2000. And the spread is a little lower. We have outliers on all these things as we do in every case. The outlier on this one is Puerto Rico at the low end, that 98.7 and we're kind of drilling down to see what produced that.

Next month, we'll have these data down to lower levels. So what are we doing in all this? Our job is to see whether we have produced a census that has consistent characteristics across all the geographical areas. In some sense, an ideal census, everyone would be measured equally well across all groups and all areas and we're looking for variation. We like low variation.

Okay, let me move on to another way of evaluating a census. The first I'll talk about is demographic analysis. This is comparing the 2010 census to different ways of estimating. On December 6th, we announced the demographic estimates for the nation. These are based on birth, death, immigration and emigration estimates. It produces national counts independent of the census. To give you a sense of how we do our work, the people working on these demographic analyses didn't talk to the decennial people throughout this process. They were sort of sequestered doing their own estimates and it was only when they finished and surfaced that we could do these comparisons.

On December 6th, we produced five different estimates. I don't know how well you can see this, the five estimates were created for the national total population between roughly 306 million and 313 million. Why? Well, the best demographers in the country told us over and over again, "There's controversy about getting the immigrant counts." People disagree on good bases. They have good rationales why the immigrant count might be different. And they said, "The only honest way to do this is to present a range of estimates." We did that. We did this before we released the census. When the census came in, as it turned out, it was very close to the middle estimate.

And then we have another way of estimating the population called population estimates that actually build off the last census. And that was pretty close, too. The April 1 population clock, using a slightly different estimation procedure, came close to that, too. We liked that result. Why do we like that result? When you do multiple ways of estimating the same thing completely independently and you get similar answers, you feel better about your process.

Well, we can drill down now to lower levels of geography on this sort of analysis to again ask the question, "Do we get the same answer if we do something else?" Now, we know something about drilling down on these population estimates. When you go to lower levels of geography, just as we saw on the percent usable records, things become noisier. We're expecting this as statisticians. So, those differences are within .1 percentage point of one another at the national level. We just released, or we're releasing Louisiana, Mississippi, New Jersey and Virginia, Louisiana and Mississippi, instead of within .1 percent are within .5 percent. This is still very low. It's natural that when you go down to smaller areas, you get a little wobble. New Jersey and Virginia, the differences are less than one percent.

But I'm going to show you right now the differences for all the states because we have it, and we're looking at it and so you ought to see it. So the next slide is the 2010 data. Let me tell you how to read this. On the X axis is a percent difference between the population estimate, this demographic analysis approach, built on the 2000 census and then grown with birth and deaths and immigration, emigration. And the Y axis is the number of states that fall in that area. These dotted lines are plus or minus one percentage point. So we can say that 34 of the 50 states lie within plus or minus one percent, and then you have some outliers.

One of the outliers on the low end is Arizona, where we have a census count four percentage points lower than the population estimate. On the high end, we have Hawaii where the census count was 4.5 percent higher than the population estimate. Well, as we did with all these evaluative tools, the question is how does this compare to 2000? That's a reasonable question. The next slide shows that. The red is 2000. This is a fantastically different distribution, right? You don't have to know much about this. So the red has shifted right relative to the blue. It's not centered around zero, the blue is sort of centered around zero, it's a little high but sort of centered around zero.

So what happened? We think there are two main reasons for the 2000 data to be shifted right away from an agreement with the census. One, we now believe that the year 2000 population estimates underestimated immigration, especially for Hispanic males in younger working ages. That led to that shifting to the right. We also believe that there was differential coverage in the 1990 census versus the 2000 census. And the red was built off of the 1990 census and grown from that.

So in other words, the year 2000 population estimates were building off a base that was probably too low, and were being compared to a census, the 2000 census, that was really much better in terms of net undercount. So in 2000, there are only two states within a .5 percentage point of the population estimates. We got more discrepancy in 2000 between the population estimates and the official census counts that we're getting now. We like this result this time better, I can tell you.

We can also break this apart to learn another thing. If you go to the next slide, we can study the difference between the population estimates and the official count as a function of the size of the state. Now, why am I taking you through this? Remember I said when you go to lower levels of geography, things become wobbly? These are the big states out here and you can just-- the blue is the 2010 number, the red is the 2000 number. Just look at the blue for a minute. And as we expect, as statisticians and demographers, the agreement line is the green. That's when the population estimate for the state equals the official count from the census. We expect to see pretty good agreement on the real big states and you see how things become noisier as you go to smaller states. These are the small states, these are the big states. More agreement on big states than small states.

So, here you see this is the same data we saw, this is Arizona, that blue dot up there is Hawaii. And you see how the red is all above the line, the official count's much higher than the population estimates for large and small. And then how the blue is scattered about. But it gets noisier with smaller estimates. So once again, why are we taking you through this? We expect that this noise occurs, that's okay. We'd like the noise to be as

small as possible because then we're getting agreement between these two methods and we'll keep you up to date on how that's going. So right now, we're quite pleased with these contrasts. The two systems agree with one another, the variation is smaller than it was in 2000.

There is a third way of evaluating a census called the post enumeration survey. It's a very large sample conducted between August and, I guess, mid-October independent of the census. And we use those interviews to determine how many of the people we find at that point and report about their April 1 residence agree with the census. I've given you some preliminary findings off of that already. The match between the survey, the post enumeration survey and the census address frame is better in 2010 than it was in 2000. The percentage of units verified as correctly enumerated better nationally 2010 to 2000. The percentage of housing units that were found to be duplicated, lower in 2010 than in 2000. All of these are desirable results.

I can now report breaking this by urban areas versus rural areas. The year 2000 finding is that the match rates were lower, the agreement rate was lower, in rural areas than in urban areas. We find this also in 2010. We're picking up a reversal that we don't yet understand that we're in this decade having higher rates of correctly enumerated cases in urban areas rather than rural areas. The opposite was true in 2000. We're drilling into that to try to figure out what's going on. That's all at the housing unit level.

And we just got some findings at the person level. So this is asking the question, "Are the people we're finding in this post enumeration survey found in the census? Is there agreement at the person level?" So far, we're getting person level match rates in the 2010 survey that are better than we got in the 2000. So once again, both at the housing unit level and the person level, it looks like things are coming in at better rates.

So let me sum up the evaluation stuff. At this preliminary stage, the vast majority of the quality indicators of the 2010 census are coming in as positive in the sense that they are

suggesting an improvement over the 2000 effort. And I promise as more of these become available, we will report them to you, both the good and the bad.

I have one more topic that I want to cover, the count question resolution program. And so I've read some press reports regarding what process we will use to address local concerns about undercounts. It is at this time that these kinds of discussions occur. We have something called a count question resolution program. It's, in one sense, the final operation of the 2010 census. It provides opportunities for tribal, state and local governments in the U.S. and Puerto Rico to challenge the official census counts. And I want to give you a sense of how this works.

There are three types of corrections for the 2010 decennial census that result from this program. One are boundary corrections addressing inaccurate reporting or inaccurate recording of boundaries legally in effect on January 1, 2010. In this case, given proper documentation from the governmental unit documenting this boundary error on our part, we will make those changes.

The second kind of change is a geo coding correction, verifying the placement of living quarters and their population within proper governmental boundaries. If we've located a dormitory in the wrong block, we can make that correction.

And the final correction are coverage corrections resulting in the addition or deletion of specific living quarters and people associated with them during the census process. But where we erroneously included them as duplicates, or excluded due to some processing error. Based on the documentation provided by a given governmental unit, we will research the records on the 2010 census processing, the operation. We'll try to find whether a processing error occurred, and then we promise to correct it when we can.

Now, what I didn't say here is something very important to know. We are not going out to redo original data collection. This program is focused on processing errors after the data

were collected, and we can correct those. We will correct the processing errors that are documented. I can give you a sense of what this looks like in terms of magnitude. In the 2000 census when this process had finished, about 2,700 people were added to the U.S. population on the base of 281 million. This in past decades has been a very small thing. Now let me note one other thing about this. This is a very different process than occurs in the population estimates program throughout the decade. Population estimates start with census as their base and then updates using vital records. Because they are estimates, we can consider alternative sources of data, and have, in the past decade supplied by local cities and civil jurisdictions and we update our estimates based on that. That is a different process than we use in count question resolution.

So I have finished. We're anticipating to have another press conference next month that will reveal more of this evaluative data and have some of the substantive data that we're releasing, some commentary on that. So I'm happy to take your questions.

MICHAEL COOK: At this point, we will begin the Q&A. Please remember if you're in the room, wait for the mic to come to you and please state your name and affiliation. And we'll be alternating between people in the room and those that are on the phone or have some questions via social media.

JERRY SHIELDS: Hi, Jerry Shields with the *Baton Rouge Advocate*. Trying to understand where we can go to the FTP site and the districting maps?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: You're the go-to guy on this, okay.

MICHAEL COOK: On all of the releases that we're putting out, the advisory that the Director mentioned today, there's going to be a link to the redistricting data office page. And on the redistricting data office page, there is a tab called data. That link isn't loaded yet, but it will shortly be there. So go to the audio site and click on the data tab.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Does that do it for you, did we--? Okay.

SEAN DALBY: Yeah, I'm Sean, I'm with Development Seed, it's a web development company in D.C. here. And I guess I had a question about the boundaries for the blocks in the census, since these aren't really government areas that have representatives themselves. My question is do the boundaries for blocks change from census to census or do they stay the same for each census?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: There are small changes, especially in those areas where development has gone on. Sometimes, there are streets put in in some inside a unit that used to be a block of a unit. And those changes are updated on the current shape files.

SEAN DALBY: Can we see the changes from 2000 to 2010 as well?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: You can. Now you're going to ask me how can you, I know, and that I don't know.

__: Under the block assignment file on the--

MICHAEL COOK: Use the mic.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Maybe a mic would be good.

__: Under the RDO data tab under block assignment files are the 2000 to 2010 block relationship files.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: And on all of these questions, if they call you, you can get the right-- so Michael Cook is the victim for your calls.

MICHAEL COOK: Yes, just remind everybody in the room and those that are listening via the webcast, the public information office number is 301-763-3030. We'll be able to set up additional interviews after today's conference, but also be able to field any of those specific questions. Now we'll go to a question via Facebook, and it asks, "When will Michigan's data be released?"

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, as I said, every week we will announce what states will come out the following weeks. And I actually don't know when manage is slated. You will know at least seven days before it's released. That's the best I can do.

MICHAEL COOK: Thank you, Dr. Groves. And now we'll go to the phones. Operator?

OPERATOR: Yes, we have a question from June Torbati with the *Baltimore Sun*.

JUNE TORBATI: Hello, yes this is June. Thank you for taking my question. I was wondering, Maryland is one of the only states, I think one of three states, that now requires prisoners to be counted as residents of their last known addresses rather than the prisons where they're housed. And I was wondering if we should consider the census data coming out next week tentative or preliminary until the state makes its own corrections or changes to that data?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: As we announced a few months ago, I believe, as soon as possible we're hoping for May, we will release a table down to the block level for states that lists counts of those persons in institutionalized quarters, in group quarters, including prisons. And that will be broken out. That is the tool that facilitates each state to make its own decision about how to handle this population, and every state is doing so.

The official counts that we are releasing today will remain the official counts. Each state is free to do redistricting in ways that they wish, and many states make small changes for

different reasons to those, to implement those procedures. That doesn't change the official counts we're giving out over the next few weeks.

MICHAEL COOK: Do we have a call or a question in the room by chance?

STEVE KILAR: Hi, Steve Kilar, Capitol News Service at the University of Maryland. I was under the impression that redistricting data was being released based on when state legislative deadlines for redistricting was going to be. And Maryland has stated that they're not going to do redistricting until the summer. So, if you could just explain some of the factors that go into how states are determined, whether they're based--

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah, this is a popular question, see if I can do it justice. And I have helpers here if I blow it. We've over the months, and probably years, we've been in contact with states to inform our deadlines to their need for the data. And whenever possible, we've tried to respect those. There's also big variation across the states in how much work is required to certify that the file is different. California is a different problem than Wyoming, as you might imagine. So some files are easy to get out, and it's that tradeoff that we're always dealing with. And we try to do the best we can to be respectful for needs, but also we want to make sure the files we deliver don't have errors in them. So it's a combination of that.

MICHAEL COOK: We'll take our next question from the phone, and to remind those that are on the phone if you do have a question, please press star one. So operator, next call?

OPERATOR: The next call is Ronald Hansen, *Arizona Republic*.

RONALD HANSEN: Yes, Dr. Groves, I wanted to see if you could address the discrepancy between the estimated population counts for Arizona in the last few years compared to the 2010 hard count. If there was any analysis that the bureau has done that

would begin to account for why the population figure would be so different. I believe we're one of the outliers there and wanted to get your thoughts on that.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: That's right, great question. We're actually looking at the outliers both on the high end and the low end. So you chose Arizona, where the official count is lower than the population estimate by about four percentage points. We're looking at that in real time. We'll all know more together when we have the lower level data. So one of the first things we want to do when the state data are released is to look at within Arizona, we can do the same sort of contrast, right? What counties have the biggest discrepancy between the population estimate and the official count? But I got to warn you when we do that about this fundamental thing. When you start looking at lower levels of geography, the population estimates become noisy, noisier, so you have to be cautious when you do that. But we'll be looking for patterns and as soon as we see patterns, we're happy to let you know what patterns we're seeing. But everyone will be able to look at those patterns. Right now, I don't have an answer for you.

MICHAEL COOK: Thank you, and do we have another question in the room? Follow-up question, one more? We'll let you take it.

SEAN DALBY: Sean Dalby again from Development Seed. I guess I had a question on the vacancy rates problem that you discussed earlier. So you said that in the Census Bureau you don't discriminate between seasonally vacant houses and houses that are vacant all year round. So the ACS surveys differentiate between the two, or is there any way we could figure out what the exact percent is?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: I actually didn't want to give you that impression. I wanted to make sure that when you got these data files that are coming out right now to realize that we haven't made that distinction. The later data files will, and you'll be able to pull those apart and do the kind of analysis that you may be interested in doing. So it's just these first round of files that have this issue.

SEAN DALBY: Okay, so is this after April 1st, then, that we'll see the--?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah, as we start releasing other data, you'll be able to separate the seasonally vacant from the others.

SEAN DALBY: Okay great, thanks.

MICHAEL COOK: Okay. Back to the room just one more time to check to see if there's any additional questions in the room? Yes, thank you.

KELLY DASCHLE: Kelly Daschle with AP Broadcast. Can you tell us anything generally about the trends in minority population? I mean, I know you're still counting, but what can you tell us about the trends in minority growth?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, I can tell you trends based not on the 2010 census, but based on the American Community Survey. And these are not news, these trends. So the growth of the Hispanic population is one of the stories that will be written out of the 2010 census, but we've seen it happen using annual estimates. We've seen the suburbanization of the Hispanic population. We've seen the spread of ethnic groups in general. Those are big power demographic trends that seem to have been going on now for several years. We should see that as a big difference between 2000 and 2010, but it won't be a surprise to the demographers and statisticians who've been watching this every year. It may be a surprise to the general public. And again, on that note, I think to inform the public, in addition to showing difference between 2000 and 2010, you'll be able to show when it started, when sort of the life cycle of the dispersion of ethnic groups to smaller towns and the growth of the Hispanic population. And that we find is an even more important story. It's a long trend.

So the data we're releasing right now, I'm honest in this, we haven't looked at these things. We're getting data out to you as fast as we can. But every state, you can write a story on race ethnicity within the state and we're giving you tables to let you do the story on the contrast between 2000 and 2010 so it's sitting there for you. We haven't done it yet. But every state is going to have a version of that story, I think.

MICHAEL COOK: And operator, we'll take our next call.

OPERATOR: Thank you, John Henrikson with *News Tribune Tacoma*.

JOHN HENRIKSON: Hello. My question is about counting deployed military. If a military personnel was deployed during the census count, my understanding is that it will be credited towards the state's population, but not the local area. Can you confirm that or comment on that?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah, you have it perfectly right, so let me just go over this. For those military deployed outside of the country, we obtain with cooperation of the Department of Defense, counts at the state level. Those are part of the apportionment information that's used to determine seats. But we don't have counts down to lower levels, exactly as you've said. So for redistricting purposes, you don't know where that count should be distributed, at least from our data.

MICHAEL COOK: And another call on the phone, operator?

OPERATOR: Yes, Lori Weisberg with *San Diego Union Tribune*.

LORI WEISBERG: Yeah, I wanted to clarify one thing you said. You talked about comparing the 2010 census to ACS over the last decade. And I guess I had thought that it wasn't appropriate to compare census numbers to ACS?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: I think it depends on what you're looking for. The kind of analysis that some people are contemplating is to look at ACS, to look at trends in ACS over the decade and do part of the story there as part of the explanation about a difference between 2000 and 2010. And if you go to the ACS website, they're giving you careful guidance about what kinds of characteristics you should and should not compare, and you ought to follow that.

MICHAEL COOK: And do we have any other questions in the room? Operator, are there any more questions on the phone?

OPERATOR: No further questions over the phone.

MICHAEL COOK: Very well. I'd like to mention in closing that we will be sending out an advisory alerting you today of the states that are forthcoming next week. Arkansas, Iowa, Indiana and Maryland. Also, we will be uploading that data into the FTP site and to locate the FTP site, it is the redistricting data office page on the data tab. And going forward, on all the advisories that we send out, we're going to make sure and put links for you directly to the American fact finder, directly to the redistricting data office, and then also directly to the electronic press kit. So the electronic press kit on our website will have all the background information for you.

Lastly, or finally, I'd like to direct your attention to a news conference that's taking place next week on February 8th. It is the Black Owned Business audio news conference. We'll be releasing lots of data at the county, city and metro level. So we hope that you mark your calendars and participate. We'd like to thank Dr. Groves for his time today, and also to let you know to call us at 301-763-3030 for additional interviews and also background information on this data. Thank you, everyone.

END OF PRESS BRIEFING